Weak Gravity Conjecture as a Razor Criterium for Exotic D-brane instantons

Andrea Addazi[1*]
[1] *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di L'Aquila, 67010 Coppito AQ and LNGS, Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso, 67010 Assergi AQ, Italy*

We discuss implications of Weak gravity conjecture (WGC) for exotic D-brane instantons. In particular, WGC leads to indirect stringent bounds on non-perturbative superpotentials generated by exotic instantons, with many implications for phenomenology: R-parity violating processes, neutrino mass, μ-problem, Neutron-Antineutron transitions and collider physics.

arXiv:1607.01203v3 [hep-th] 14 Jul 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

The Weak Gravity Conjecture (WGC) states that the weakest force is gravity [1] [1]. This implies that for each abelian gauge boson $U_X(1)$, there must be a light charged particle with mass m and charge q_X satisfying the bound

$$\frac{m}{q_X} \leq M_{Pl} \tag{1}$$

In other words, for every $U_X(1)$ gauge in 4-d there is a new UV scale satisfying the bound

$$\Lambda_X = g_X M_{Pl} = \frac{g_X}{\sqrt{G_N}} \tag{2}$$

The WGC is motivated by two main arguments: i) global abelian symmetries cannot exist in string theory; ii) the absence of black hole remnants, motivated by holography [22]. We mention that a possible test of the WGC applied to a long-range $U(1)_{B-L}$ can be in Neutron-Antineutron oscillation experiments (See [19–21] for recent analysis of stringent limits on B-L couplings to neutrons (antineutrons)).

A more surprising result is that, according to Weak gravity conjecture, Eq.(1) should be also true for magnetic monopoles. For example, for a t'Hooft-Polyakov monopole obtained by the Higgsing $SU(2) \to U(1)$, the Weak gravity conjecture sets a bound which reads

$$M_{mon} \leq g_m M_{Pl} \sim \frac{1}{g_X} M_{Pl} \tag{3}$$

where g_m is the monopole magnetic charge. This bound is also understood by the fact that a fundamental monopole cannot have an energy density higher than black hole one. As is well known, monopoles and gauge instantons are always in a correspondence. In particular, gauge instantons in a d-dimensional YM theory correspond to monopole solutions in higher dimensional YM theories closed by domain walls [35]. In particular, the action of instantons is $S = M_{mon}/v_X$, i.e. it is bounded by Eq.(3). These arguments can be generalized in string theories. In particular Euclidean D-brane instantons in IIA and IIB superstring theories can be understood as a generalization of the soliton/instanton correspondence: a stringy instanton in the effective low energy 4-d theory corresponds to a Euclidean D-brane in the 10-d superstring theory. As is known, Euclidean D-(p-4) branes wrapping the same n-cycles of ordinary D-p branes on the Calabi-Yau internal space reproduce YM gauge instantons in the low energy 4-d gauge theory ($\alpha' = l_s^2 \to 0$). However, it exists a new class of instantons, dub *exotic instantons*, associated to Euclidean D-(p-4) branes wrapping different n-cycles than background D-p branes. This implies that exotic instantons are not related to any gauge couplings of the $d = 4$ effective gauge theory. Intriguingly, they can generate new effective superpotential terms among fields even if not allowed at perturbative level [2]. Recently, we discussed possible implications of exotic instantons in $B - L$ physics. In fact, contrary to gauge instantons, exotic instantons could violate $U(1)$ vector-like symmetries like $B - L$ with a strong coupling. For example, $\Delta B = 2$ violating processes like Neutron-Antineutron transitions can be generated from several different models, without destabilizing the proton [23–34]. So that, it is important to identify a possible *razor principle* for exotic instantons which, rephrasing Arkani-Hamed *et al* (in Ref. [1]), could select *D-brane instantons of the Landscape against ones of Swamplands*. In this paper, we suggest an extension of the Weak gravity conjecture to exotic stringy instantons. In particular, we will see how the weak gravity conjecture on exotic instantons can provide stringent constrains for internal spaces and n-cycle geometries. We will show how the WGC on exotic instantons leads to interesting predictions in phenomenology.

II. WGC BOUNDS TO E2-BRANES IN IIA STRING THEORY

In this section, we will discuss the WGC on Exotic Instantons in the specific context of IIA open string

* andrea.addazi@infn.lngs.it

[1] We mention that recently many papers on weak gravity conjecture in context of N-field and axion monodromy inflation appeared [2, 4–7, 9–12]. Other recent applications can be found in Refs. [13–18].

[2] D-brane instantons were studied in various quiver theories without and with fluxes in Refs.[36–38, 40, 41] (See also Ref. [39] for a review on D-brane instantons).

theories with intersecting D6-brane stacks wrapping 3-cycles in the CY_3 and Euclidean D2-brane (E2-brane, exotic) instantons wrapping (different) 3-cycles in the CY_3. Of course, the following considerations can be easily generalized to other open string theories: i) type IIB open string theories, with space-filling D3-branes and D7-branes wrapping holomorphic divisors in a CY_3 and (exotic) E3-branes wrapping (different) holomorphic divisors, ii) type I open string theories with magnetized D9-branes wrapping a CY_3 and (exotic) magnetized E5-branes

FIG. 1. a) The intersections among the $D6$-brane stack (double line) and the $E2$-brane. Modulini τ, α are localized among the $E2-D6$ intersections while the physical field is in the intersection $D6-D6$. b) The dual mixed disk amplitude with modulini α, τ and the physical field Φ. In the limit $\alpha' \to 0$, the mixed disk amplitude generates an effective lagrangian term among α, τ, Φ. Integrating on the modulini space, this leads to the generation of a new superpotential dependent by the number of intersections among $D6$-brane stacks and $E2$-brane.



A. Theoretical preliminaries

In type IIA open string theories, E2-branes can intersect D6-brane stacks and open strings localized among these intersections correspond to fermionic zero modes of the exotic instantons. In the low energy limit $\alpha' \to 0$,

$$\mathcal{W}_{n.p.} = e^{-S_{E2}} M_S^{-N+3} \Phi^N \tag{4}$$

where Φ^N is a charged combination of a $U(1)$ gauge symmetry. The microscopic mechanism generating Eq.(4) is displayed in Fig.1 (see Ref.[39] for a complete review on these aspects). The imaginary part of the instanton action is related to the pseudoscalar field shifting under a $U(1)$ gauge symmetry. The relevant $U(1)$ is broken by a Stčkelberg mechanism due to a coupling of its gauge curvature with closed strings (RR fields) as $B \wedge F$. The instanton coupling contains the instanton action which is complex and given by DBI+CS terms:

$$Re\, S_{E2} = \mathcal{V}_{\Pi_3} g_S^{-1}, \;\; Im\, S_{E2} = \sum_r c_r a_r \tag{5}$$

where a_r are the RR axions which are coupled to the $E2$-brane.

For a $D6$-brane models, we generically have a set of different D6-brane stacks labeled as $A, B, C, ...$ The 3-cycles Π_A of the $D6_A$-brane can be decomposed in a basis $\{C_r\}$ of homology 3-cycles:

$$\Pi_A = \sum_r p_{Ar} C_r \tag{6}$$

On the other hand, the coupling of a second $D6_B$-brane to the RR axions a_r demands the shift symmetry

$$a_r \to N_B (p_{Br} - p_{B^* r}) \Lambda_B \tag{7}$$

This implies the shift symmetry

$$e^{-S_{E2}} \to e^{-i \sum_A N_A (I_{MA} - I_{MA^*}) \Lambda_A} e^{-S_{E2}} \tag{8}$$

Constrains in the intersection numbers of $E2$-branes and $D6$-branes 3-cycles:

$$I_{Ma} - I_{Ma^*} = I_{Mb} - I_{Mb^*} = 0 \tag{9}$$

$$I_{Mc} - I_{Mc^*} = I_{Md} - I_{Md^*} = 2 \tag{10}$$

where $I_{Ma} = \Pi_M \cdot \Pi_a$ are the numbers of intersections among the $E2$-brane and $D6$-branes. Under this condition, the shift term of Φ^N under $U(1)$ is exactly compensated by the shift symmetry of the instanton coupling.

B. Weak gravity conjecture and E2-branes

The E2-brane is charged with respect to n RR fields in turns related to the Stüeckelberg breaking of n (anomalous and non-anomalous) $U(1)$s. On the other hand, ordinary E2-branes corresponding to gauge instantons are constrained by the low energy limit bound (3), $M \leq g_{YM}^{-1} M_{Pl}$ where $g_{YM}^2 = (2\pi)^4 g_S \mathcal{V}_{\Pi_3}^{-1}$. The generalized WGC bound on a Dp-brane with tension T_p and sum of Dp-brane charges Q is

$$\frac{T_p}{Q} \leq M_{Pl}^{p+1} \tag{11}$$

For an E2-brane, Eq.(11) corresponds to

$$\frac{\mathcal{V}_{\Pi_3}}{g_s} \leq \left(\sum_r c_r\right) \left(\frac{M_{Pl}}{M_s}\right)^3 = \left(\sum_r c_r\right) \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}_6}}{(2\pi)^{7/2} g_s}\right)^3 \tag{12}$$

which in turn corresponds to

$$|e^{S_{E2}}| \leq e^{\sqrt{2} \left(\sum_r c_r\right) \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}_6}}{(2\pi)^{7/2} g_s}\right)^3} \tag{13}$$

The violation of Eq.(12) implies that an extremal black hole remnant with RR E-brane charges equal to the black hole mass (normalized in Planck units) could be formed, which is in contrast with holographic arguments.

The WGC bounds should be combined with the semi-classical approximation bound

$$|e^{S_{E2}}| \geq e^{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\mathcal{V}_s}{g_s}\right)^2 + \left(\sum_r c_r\right)^2}} \tag{14}$$

where $\mathcal{V}_s$ is the string volume of the 3-cycles. For example, for a 3-cycle cilindrical geometry, $\mathcal{V}_s = \pi^2$. Essentially, Eq.2 is an universal stringy bound on the instanton-antinstanton bubbles or instanton partition functions.

So that, weak gravity conjecture constrains 3-cycle size wrapped by the E2-branes, the string coupling the internal volume (the string scale over the planck scale).

Finally, if $M \geq M_{Pl}$ in the superpotential Ref.(4) for $N > 3$, quantum gravity (mainly corrections to the superpotential from reggeized gravitons exchanges) corrections should affect our instantonic calculations. So that, we impose a calculability bound

$$|e^{S_{E2}}| \leq \left(\frac{M_{Pl}}{M_s}\right)^{N-3} = \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}_6}}{(2\pi)^{7/2} g_s}\right)^{N-3} \tag{15}$$

for $N > 3$. On the other hand, for $N = 2$ (bilinear superpotentials), $M \leq M_{Pl}$ in order to neglect quantum gravity corrections and

$$|e^{-S_{E2}}| \leq \left(\frac{M_s}{M_{Pl}}\right) = \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}_6}}{(2\pi)^{7/2} g_s}\right)^{-1} \tag{16}$$

III. IMPLICATIONS IN PHENOMENOLOGY

FIG. 2. (Un)orientied quiver theory embedding the (MS)SM and generating through an Exotic E-brane Instanton a six quark superpotential (See Eq.(22). This model was discussed in companion papers [30, 31]. For instance, this quiver is (locally) compatible with the tadpole cancellations and SM hypercharge conditions discussed and applied in Refs. [51–54].



In this section, we will discuss the application of WGC and the semiclassical bound for a set of superpotentials

FIG. 3. In the same model of Fig.2, an Exotic E-brane instanton generating a Weinberg operator as Eq.(21) is displayed.



generated by exotic E-brane instantons studied in literature [23–34, 43–48, 50].

For Trilinear Yukawa couplings, the window allowed by WGC and semiclassical bounds is

$$e^{-\sqrt{2}(\sum_r c_r)\left(\frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}_6}}{(2\pi)^{7/2} g_s}\right)^3} \leq |e^{-S_{E2}}| \leq e^{-\sqrt{\left(\frac{\mathcal{V}_s}{g_s}\right)^2 + \left(\sum_r c_r\right)^2}} \tag{17}$$

These constrains allow a various set of possible coupling $e^{|S_{E2}|}$. For example, for high scale string theory $M_s \simeq 10^{15}\,\text{GeV}$, $\mathcal{V}_6 g_s \simeq 1$, $g_s \simeq 10^{-3}$, WGC lower bound is easily satisfied ($|e^{-S_{E2}}| \geq e^{-10^9}$ or so), while the semiclassical upper bound is expected to be of order one because of RR charge contribution. So that, R-parity violating operators destabilizing the proton like

$$Y_1 e^{-S_{E2'}} U^c D^c D^c, \;\; Y_2 e^{-S_{E2''}} LQD^c, \;\; Y_3 e^{-S_{E3'''}} LLE^c \tag{18}$$

can be naturally suppressed without violating the WGC. As well as the generation of a small Dirac mass term for the neutrino like

$$\mathcal{L} = y_\nu e^{-S_{E_2}} \langle H \rangle \bar{\nu}_L \nu_R \tag{19}$$

without any see-saw mechanisms. However, we should note that this imposes a bound on the number of RR charges. As a consequence, a quiver theory with a large number of D-brane stacks (order $N_{stacks} > 10^3$) would enhance the WGC bound for non-perturbative trilinear couplings. This seems to imply that SM has to be embedded in a quiver with few D-brane stacks nodes (this is also desired for minimality).

For bilinear terms like the μ-term and $\mu' HL$, with $\mu = M_S e^{-S_{E2}}$ and similarly μ', a combination of Eqs.(13,14,16).

This means that a scenario in which $M_S \simeq M_{GUT} \simeq 10^{15}\,\text{GeV}$ with $\mu \simeq TeV$ ($|e^{-S_2}| \simeq 10^{-12}$) is constrained

by WGC, because $\mathcal{V}_6, \mathcal{V}_{\Pi_3} \geq 1$ while $g_s \leq 1$. In particular,

$$e^{-\sqrt{2}(\sum_r c_r)\left(\frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}_6}}{(2\pi)^{7/2} g_s}\right)^3} \leq |e^{-S_{E2}}| \leq 10^{-12}$$

implying

$$\sqrt{2}\left(\sum_r c_r\right)\left(\frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{V}_6}}{(2\pi)^{7/2} g_s}\right)^3 > 12$$

which can be easily satisfied in perturbative string theory.

Let us now discuss a proton decay superpotential generated by E2-brane instantons:

$$\mathcal{W} = \frac{e^{-S_{E2}}}{M_s} QQQL \to \mathcal{O}_{p-decay} = \frac{e^{-S_{E2}}}{M_s M_{SUSY}} qqql \quad (20)$$

which is constrained up to

$$M_s M_{SUSY} e^{+S_{E2}} > (10^{15}\,\text{GeV})^2$$

Let us suppose a scenario with $M_s, M_{SUSY} \simeq 1 \div 100\,\text{TeV}$, In this case, the $e^{+S_{E2}} > 10^{18} \div 10^{24}$, which constrains $(g_s^{-1}, \mathcal{V}_{\Pi_3}, \mathcal{V}_6) >> 1$. In the opposite regime $M_S \simeq M_{SUSY} \simeq 10^{15}\,\text{GeV}$, the coupling $e^{+S_{E2}}$ could be much smaller in order to satisfy the experimental constrains, i.e. $\mathcal{V}_6, \mathcal{V}_3 \simeq 1$. However, semiclassical and quantum gravity bounds imply that the effective proton-decay scale is $M_s \leq M_{p-decay} \leq M_{Pl}$. The same proton-decay bounds can be applied to E2-branes (directly) generating a Weinberg superpotential as

$$\mathcal{W} = \frac{e^{-S_{E2}}}{M_s} H_u L H_u L \to \frac{e^{-S_{E2}}}{M_s M_{SUSY}} hlhl \quad (21)$$

Assuming $M_s, M_{SUSY} \simeq 1 \div 100\,\text{TeV}$, the effective scale $e^{+S_{E2}} M_s M_{SUSY} \simeq 10^{12} \div 10^{13}\,\text{GeV}$. So that, in analogy with proton-decay operator, $e^{+S_{E2}} >> 1$ ($e^{+S_{E2}} \simeq 10^{15} \div 10^{21}$). As for proton decay, WGC demands $(g_s^{-1}, \mathcal{V}_{\Pi_3}, \mathcal{V}_6) >> 1$. A scenario with $M_{SUSY} \simeq M_S \simeq 10^{15}\,\text{GeV}$ is not compatible for any value of $e^{+S_{E2}}$ with a scale $10^{12} \div 10^{13}\,\text{GeV}$ for the neutrino Majorana mass. A possible scenario which is compatible with WGC is $e^{+S_{E2}} \simeq 1$ while $M_s M_{SUSY} \simeq (10^{12} \div 10^{13}\,\text{GeV})^2$. However, $e^{+S_{E2}} \simeq 1$ violates the semiclassical bound.

In Refs.[30, 31], we suggested that a six quark $\Delta B = 2$ transition can be generated by only one exotic instanton solution as

$$\mathcal{W} = \frac{1}{M_S^3} e^{-S_{E2}} \mathcal{Y}_{f_1 f_2 f_3 f_4 f_5 f_6} U^c_{f_1} D^c_{f_2} D^c_{f_3} U^c_{f_4} D^c_{f_5} D^c_{f_6} \quad (22)$$

After the supersymmetric quark-squark reduction (mediated by gauginos) , this operator can generate an effective neutron-antineutron operator

$$\mathcal{O}_{n\bar{n}} = \frac{Y_1}{\Lambda^5_{n\bar{n}}} u^c d^c d^c u^c d^c d^c \quad (23)$$

$$\Lambda^5_{n\bar{n}} = e^{+S_{E2}} M_S^3 M_{SUSY}^2 \geq (300\,\text{TeV})^5$$

where 300 TeV is the current best experimental bound. Next generation of experiments can enhance the current bound up to 1000 TeV scale. Let us assume that $M_{SUSY} \simeq M_S$. In principle, in order to generate a 1000 TeV $n-\bar{n}$ transition with a $M_S = 10\,\text{TeV}$, one could consider a $Y_1 |e^{S_{E2}}| \simeq 10^{10}$, which corresponds to large 3-cycles wrapped by the $E2$. However, the weak gravity conjecture sets a bound on the largeness of the (inverse) instanton coupling. For example, in a scenario in which $g_s^{-2}\mathcal{V}_6 \simeq 1$, a large instantonic mass scale is excluded: the string scale must be $M_s << M_{Pl}$, i.e. $\mathcal{V}_6 >> g_s^2$. So that, in this scenario Regge stringy states can be searched in the next run of LHC while KK-modes cannot be TeV-ish particles.

A situation with $M_S \simeq M_{SUSY} \simeq 1000\,\text{TeV}$, $Y_1 e^{+S_{E2}} \simeq 1$ is possible but cannot be controlled in semiclassical instantonic methods. Such a situation corresponds to collapsed three-cycles on a singularity in the CY_3 ($\mathcal{V}_{\Pi_3} << 1$). This case can be easily compatible with WGC in a larger landscape of parameters with respect to the case discussed above. However, this scenario is less appealing from the calculation point of view (non-perturbative uncontrolled regime).

A scenario which is interesting for future 100 TeV proton-proton colliders beyond LHC is $M_S \simeq M_{SUSY} \simeq 50 \div 100\,\text{TeV}$. In this case, a 1000 TeV neutron-antineutron transition can be generated for $Y_1 |e^{+S_{E2}}| \simeq 10^5 \div 10^6$, which is not viable for $g_s^{-2}\mathcal{V}_6 \simeq 1$ ($M_S \simeq M_{Pl}$) because of WGC. So that, in this scenario $M_s << M_{Pl}$, i.e. Regge states and no KK modes for a 100 TeV proton-proton collider. In this case, there is also the interesting possibility to observe the $\Delta B = 2$ exotic instanton in direct binary quark collisions, as $qq \to \tilde{q}\tilde{q}\tilde{q}\tilde{q}$. In fact, while neutron-antineutron transitions are constrained up to 300 TeV, other six quarks operators involving heavier flavors can be tested in 100 TeV colliders, i.e. the Yukawa matrix components of other flavors are not directly constrained by $n - \bar{n}$ experiments. For instance, the cross section is expected to be polynomially growing with the CM energy for $E_{CM} < M$, while unitarized and exponentially softened for $E_{CM} >> M$ at fixed scattering angle [31].

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND REMARKS

In this letter, we have discussed many implications of the Weak Gravity Conjecture for exotic stringy instantons. In particular, we have considered the case of type IIA open string theory. We have shown how WGC on exotic instantons can provide a strong bound on effective superpotentials generated by E-branes. For instance, WGC constrains 3-cycles geometries of the E2-brane instantons, the string coupling and the internal six-dimensional volume. For example, we have argued that, if a 1000 TeV neutron-antineutron transition was observed, WGC, applied on the direct generation mechanism from a $E2$-brane instanton in low scale string the-

ory, would imply a precise set of observables for the next generation of colliders. Assuming the string scale $M_s = 10 \div 100\,\text{TeV}$, we have shown how the internal space volume must be very large, i.e. 100 TeV proton-proton colliders beyond LHC should observe Regge string states and not KK states.

We have also discussed WGC implications on bilinear and trilinear R-parity violating operators, Dirac neutrino mass, proton decay operators and μ-term from exotic instantons.

We conclude that the Weak Gravity Conjecture, which is a statement on quantum gravity and black holes, seems to be unexpectedly predictive in string-inspired particle physics. Exotic instantons may have an important role in the UV completion of the standard model of particles and cosmology from basic principles of the string theory. WGC could be a razor criterium which may be crucially important for our understanding of string phenomenology.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank organizers and participants of String Phenomenology 2016 (Ioannina, Greece) for inspiring talks and conversations, as well as A.P. Wine for interesting suggestions and remarks. My work was supported in part by the MIUR research grant Theoretical Astroparticle Physics PRIN 2012CP-PYP7 and by SdC Progetto speciale Multiasse La Societá della Conoscenza in Abruzzo PO FSE Abruzzo 2007-2013.

[1] N. Arkani-Hamed, L. Motl, A. Nicolis and C. Vafa, JHEP **0706** (2007) 060 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/06/060 [hep-th/0601001].
[2] L. E. Ibanez, M. Montero, A. Uranga and I. Valenzuela, JHEP **1604** (2016) 020 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2016)020 [arXiv:1512.00025 [hep-th]].
[3] J. Brown, W. Cottrell, G. Shiu and P. Soler, JHEP **1510** (2015) 023 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2015)023 [arXiv:1503.04783 [hep-th]].
[4] A. Hebecker, P. Mangat, F. Rompineve and L. T. Witkowski, Phys. Lett. B **748** (2015) 455 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.07.026 [arXiv:1503.07912 [hep-th]].
[5] A. Hebecker, F. Rompineve and A. Westphal, JHEP **1604** (2016) 157 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2016)157 [arXiv:1512.03768 [hep-th]].
[6] B. Heidenreich, M. Reece and T. Rudelius, JHEP **1512** (2015) 108 doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2015)108 [arXiv:1506.03447 [hep-th]].
[7] J. Brown, W. Cottrell, G. Shiu and P. Soler, JHEP **1510** (2015) 023 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2015)023 [arXiv:1503.04783 [hep-th]].
[8] J. Brown, W. Cottrell, G. Shiu and P. Soler, JHEP **1604** (2016) 017 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2016)017 [arXiv:1504.00659 [hep-th]].
[9] K. Kooner, S. Parameswaran and I. Zavala, Phys. Lett. B **759** (2016) 402 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.05.082 [arXiv:1509.07049 [hep-th]].
[10] T. Rudelius, JCAP **1509** (2015) no.09, 020 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2015/09/020, 10.1088/1475-7516/2015/9/020 [arXiv:1503.00795 [hep-th]].
[11] D. Junghans, JHEP **1602** (2016) 128 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2016)128 [arXiv:1504.03566 [hep-th]].
[12] J. Brown, W. Cottrell, G. Shiu and P. Soler, JHEP **1604** (2016) 017 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2016)017 [arXiv:1504.00659 [hep-th]].
[13] C. Cheung and G. N. Remmen, JHEP **1412** (2014) 087 doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2014)087 [arXiv:1407.7865 [hep-th]].
[14] C. Cheung and G. N. Remmen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113** (2014) 051601 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.051601 [arXiv:1402.2287 [hep-ph]].
[15] M. Li, W. Song and T. Wang, JHEP **0603** (2006) 094 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/03/094 [hep-th/0601137].
[16] B. Heidenreich, M. Reece and T. Rudelius, arXiv:1605.05311 [hep-th].
[17] B. Heidenreich, M. Reece and T. Rudelius, arXiv:1606.08437 [hep-th].
[18] M. Montero, G. Shiu and P. Soler, arXiv:1606.08438 [hep-th].
[19] A. Addazi, Nuovo Cim. C **38**, no. 1, 21 (2015). doi:10.1393/ncc/i2015-15021-6
[20] A. Addazi, Z. Berezhiani and Y. Kamyshkov, arXiv:1607.00348 [hep-ph].
[21] K. S. Babu and R. N. Mohapatra, arXiv:1606.08374 [hep-ph].
[22] L. Susskind, hep-th/9501106.
[23] A. Addazi and M. Bianchi, JHEP **1412** (2014) 089 [arXiv:1407.2897 [hep-ph]].
[24] A. Addazi, JHEP **1504** (2015) 153 [arXiv:1501.04660 [hep-ph]].
[25] A. Addazi and M. Bianchi, JHEP **1507** (2015) 144 doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2015)144 [arXiv:1502.01531 [hep-ph]].
[26] A. Addazi and M. Bianchi, JHEP **1506** (2015) 012 [arXiv:1502.08041 [hep-ph]].
[27] A. Addazi, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **31** (2016) no.17, 1650109 doi:10.1142/S0217732316501091 [arXiv:1504.06799 [hep-ph]].
[28] A. Addazi, arXiv:1505.00625 [hep-ph], to appear in Elect.J.Th.Phys.
[29] A. Addazi, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **31** (2016) no.16, 1650084 doi:10.1142/S0217751X16500846 [arXiv:1505.02080 [hep-ph]].
[30] A. Addazi, Phys. Lett. B **757** (2016) 462 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.04.018 [arXiv:1506.06351 [hep-ph]].
[31] A. Addazi, arXiv:1510.02911 [hep-ph], MGM14 (C15-07-12) .
[32] A. Addazi, M. Bianchi and G. Ricciardi, JHEP **1602** (2016) 035 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2016)035 [arXiv:1510.00243 [hep-ph]].
[33] A. Addazi, J. W. F. Valle and C. A. Vaquera-Araujo, Phys. Lett. B **759** (2016) 471 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.06.015 [arXiv:1604.02117

[hep-ph]].
[34] A. Addazi and M. Khlopov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **31** (2016) no.19, 1650111 doi:10.1142/S021773231650111X [arXiv:1604.07622 [hep-ph]].
[35] G. Dvali, H. B. Nielsen and N. Tetradis, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 085005 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.085005 [arXiv:0710.5051 [hep-th]].
[36] M. Bianchi, F. Fucito and J. F. Morales, JHEP **0707** (2007) 038 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/07/038 [arXiv:0704.0784 [hep-th]].
[37] M. Billo, L. Ferro, M. Frau, F. Fucito, A. Lerda and J. F. Morales, JHEP **0810** (2008) 112 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/10/112 [arXiv:0807.1666 [hep-th]].
[38] M. Bianchi and J. F. Morales, JHEP **0802** (2008) 073 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/02/073 [arXiv:0712.1895 [hep-th]].
[39] M. Bianchi and M. Samsonyan, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **24** (2009) 5737 doi:10.1142/S0217751X09048022 [arXiv:0909.2173 [hep-th]].
[40] M. Bianchi, A. Collinucci and L. Martucci, Fortsch. Phys. **60** (2012) 914 doi:10.1002/prop.201200030 [arXiv:1202.5045 [hep-th]].
[41] M. Bianchi and G. Inverso, Fortsch. Phys. **60** (2012) 822 doi:10.1002/prop.201200047 [arXiv:1202.6508 [hep-th]].
[42] M. Bianchi, F. Fucito and J. F. Morales, JHEP **0908** (2009) 040 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/08/040 [arXiv:0904.2156 [hep-th]].
[43] L. E. Ibanez and A. M. Uranga, JHEP **0703** (2007) 052 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/03/052 [hep-th/0609213].
[44] R. Blumenhagen, M. Cvetic and T. Weigand, Nucl. Phys. B **771** (2007) 113 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2007.02.016 [hep-th/0609191].
[45] L. E. Ibanez, A. N. Schellekens and A. M. Uranga, JHEP **0706** (2007) 011 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/06/011 [arXiv:0704.1079 [hep-th]].
[46] R. Blumenhagen, M. Cvetic, S. Kachru and T. Weigand, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **59** (2009) 269 doi:10.1146/annurev.nucl.010909.083113 [arXiv:0902.3251 [hep-th]].
[47] R. Blumenhagen, M. Cvetic, R. Richter and T. Weigand, JHEP **0710** (2007) 098 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/10/098 [arXiv:0708.0403 [hep-th]].
[48] R. Blumenhagen, M. Cvetic, D. Lust, R. Richter and T. Weigand, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100** (2008) 061602 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.061602 [arXiv:0707.1871 [hep-th]].
[49] M. Cvetic, J. Halverson, P. Langacker and R. Richter, JHEP **1010** (2010) 094 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2010)094 [arXiv:1001.3148 [hep-th]].
[50] H. Abe, T. Kobayashi, Y. Tatsuta and S. Uemura, Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.2, 026001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.026001 [arXiv:1502.03582 [hep-ph]].
[51] M. Cvetic, J. Halverson and R. Richter, JHEP **0912** (2009) 063 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/12/063 [arXiv:0905.3379 [hep-th]].
[52] M. Cvetic, J. Halverson and P. Langacker, JHEP **1009** (2010) 076 doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2010)076 [arXiv:1006.3341 [hep-th]].
[53] M. Cvetic, J. Halverson and P. Langacker, JHEP **1111** (2011) 058 doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2011)058 [arXiv:1108.5187 [hep-ph]].
[54] M. Cvetic, J. Halverson and P. Langacker, arXiv:1512.07622 [hep-ph].